

Re: **Case No.: 5:12- CV- 00222-EJD**
SMITH vs. INTUIT, INC.

FILED

2013 SEP -3 P 5:07

RECEIVED
CLERK OF COURT

I Jordon Echols , object to the proposed settlement in this case. I am a class member and I received an email notice of the settlement on July 21, 2013, my email is jordan4407@yahoo.com. I have never objected to a class action settlement before.

This case was originally filed in 2012 and was settled after one year but the results obtained for the class is poor. The lawyers get the money. This settlement doesn't pass the smell test, it appears the lawyers were afraid of losing and settled so they could get their fees. I note the class representatives get much more than the average class member. Did they do a good job for the class? It appears not.

The Court should reject the settlement as a token settlement to enrich class counsel at the expense of the class members and the settlement is not fair and reasonable for the class members because the only people to benefit financially are the lawyers. We are not told in the notice how many members are in the class or even how much money the attorneys sought as damages. Without that information how can class member judge if the settlement was good or bad. However, TurboTax I would guess that charged many times over what they are paying to settle this case and is probably viewed as a mere nuisance.


The amount of the proposed fees in relation to the alleged benefits to the class renders the settlement unfair and unreasonable. The amount of the proposed attorneys' fees is part of whether the settlement is fair, reasonable, and adequate. How much time did the layers actually spend working on this case?

How many claims have been filed? How was the \$10 mentioned in the notice arrived at?

The amount of the proposed fees in relation to the alleged benefits to the class renders the settlement unfair and unreasonable. The amount of the proposed attorneys' fees make it appear the only people benefiting from this settlement are the attorneys.

I want the Court deny the proposed settlement and deny the requested fees to Class Counsel.

Dated: August 28, 2013.

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "Jordon Echols", is written over a horizontal line.

Jordon Echols
4934 Tremont
Dallas, Texas 75214

August 28, 2013

Clerk, U. S. District Court
United States District Court for
The Northern District of
California (San Jose Division)
Robert F. Peckham Federal Building. Second Floor
280 South 1st Street
San Jose, CA 95113

ATTORNEYS FOR PLAINTIFFS FREDIERICK AND TASHA SMITH:

CARNEY WILLIAMS BATES
PULLIAM & BOWMAN, PLLC
Hank Bates (Ca. # 167688)
11311 Arcade Drive, Suite 200
Little Rock, Arkansas 72212

MILSTEIN ADELMAN, LLP:

Gillian Wade (Ca. # 229124)
Isaac Miller (Ca. # 266459)
2800 Donald Douglas Loop North
Santa Monica, California 90405

ATTORNEYS FOR DEFENDANT INTUIT, INC.:

MARK A. PERRY
AUSTIN V. SCHWING
555 Mission Street, Suite 3000
San Francisco, CA 94105-2933

SARAH BROWN HADJIMARKOS
GIBSON, DUNN & CRUTCHER, LLP
1881 Page Mill Road
Palo Alto, CA 94304-1211